

Sinclair
Broadcasting's
decision to force
their stations to
air a
pro-Bush/anti-Kerry
"documentary" days
before the election
is a clear example
of the dangers of
media consolidation.
This is clearly a
political
advertisement and
NOT "news". The
airtime should be
considered a
political
contribution. This
broadcast demands to
be labelled as a
political ad. It
demands equal time
for the opposition.

Sinclair uses the
public airwaves free
of charge, and is
obligated by law to
serve the public
interest. But when
large companies
control the
airwaves, we get
more of what's good
for the bottom line
and less of what we
need for our
democracy. Instead
of something
produced at "News
Central" far away,
it's more important
that we see real
people from our own
communities and more
substantive news
about issues that
matter.

Sinclair's actions
show why we need to
strengthen media
ownership rules, not
weaken them. They
show why the license
renewal process

needs to involve
more than a returned
postcard. Thank you.